

**REMARKS**

In light of this amendment and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-13 are in this application, with claims 1, 6, and 10 having been amended.

In the Office Action, claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Using Netscape 2* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,449,653 to Klemets, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,047,292 to Kelly.

Independent claim 1, as amended, is representative and recites in pertinent part:

searching means for searching said detected character information for address information representing the one of (i) the URL used to obtain information associated with said programs and (ii) the electronic mail address (e-mail), wherein **said searching means searches sub-code information in a sub-code area of the recording medium for the character information**; (emphasis added)

(Independent claims 6 and 10 recite similar limitations).

As amended, claim 1 recites a searching means, "wherein said searching means searches sub-code information in a sub-code area of the recording medium for the character information." It is respectfully submitted that none of the relied upon portions of the Netscape reference, teach or suggest searching sub-code information in a sub-code area of the recording medium for the character information.

Further, in the office action, the Examiner relies upon the Netscape reference, and in particular page 438 for teaching a searching means. Page 438 of the Netscape reference describes in part an audio player application called TSPlay32. A user can run this player all by itself and choose to load and play an audio file from a disk; or, the user can type in a **complete** URL or web address, and it will connect to the Web and play a file directly from the URL site where the file is stored without the aid of the browser. However, it is respectfully submitted that

the relied upon portion of Netscape, namely page 438, fails to disclose, “searching said detected character information for address information representing” a URL or email address. The Examiner has attempted to equate searching with the inputting of a complete URL by a user into a web address box. It is respectfully submitted that the inputting of a complete URL by a user into a web address box is not searching. As the Examiner points out, if the URL address that is entered in the web address box is incorrect an error message is displayed. In contrast, when one searches with an incorrect search term, no error message should appear, rather, results based on that incorrect term should appear. Further support for the differences between a web address box and a search function can be found at nearly every computer desktop with internet access where both a search field and a web address box can be found. If these were the same or understood to be interchangeable as the Examiner alleges, there would be no need for two separate components being offered. Accordingly, it is submitted that the relied upon portion of Netscape does not teach the searching means specifically recited in claim 1

As the Netscape reference does not disclose the above-quoted features, it is submitted that that independent claims 1, 6 and 10 patentably distinguish over the combination of those portions Netscape, Klemets, and Kelly, applied by the Examiner, and are allowable. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7-9 and 11-13 depend from one of claims 1, 6 and 10 and allowable therewith.


**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance; and an early notice to this effect is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By:   
Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800